

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

**REMARKS**

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been carefully considered. In an effort to expedite the prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to include dependent claim 2. The following comments pertain to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker (U.S. 6,240,396)

1. Concerning the feature "transmitting an account address and a demand for issuance from a user terminal unit to an issuer unit" specified in claim 1, the Examiner refers to Fig. 5C and corresponding descriptions at col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4. It is not clear whether the Examiner regards the table 530 as corresponding to the account unit in the present invention.

The description from col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 4 of the Walker patent is only directed to the contents of customer table 530 which are provided by each customer (i.e. user) during the registration process. Fig. 5C shows information on each customer stored in a customer table 530. As explained at col. 5, lines 1-4, names and addresses are stored as part of the customer information, but such information has nothing to do with an account address which represents an address of the account unit where the user's electronic ticket is stored.

2. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to transmit the demand for issuance to an account unit which corresponds to the account address" in claim 1, the Examiner refers to the Abstract and col. 7, lines 58-67 and col. 8, lines 1-62 of the reference. However, there is no disclosure of transmitting account address and demand for issuance to an issuer unit in the referred portions. Applicant is puzzled as to why the Examiner recites the Abstract which does not describe anything relating to the account address or the account unit of the present invention. The Abstract mentions purchase offers and acceptance, payment and a delivery of the ticket, but does not teach from where and to where the ticket is sent.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

The description at col. 8, lines 26-62 relates to a process by which the user logs onto the system; and particularly mentions the case when the log on is the first time for the user, processes for registration and issuance of customer ID are performed as explained in the Remarks of the previous amendment.

3. With respect to the feature "to obtain a user identifier from the account unit", the Examiner refers to the same Fig. 5C and portions in the description as those referred to in paragraph 1 above. The customer table 530 certainly contains user identifiers but any process of obtaining user ID by the issuer unit is not suggested.

4. With respect to the feature "to prepare an electronic ticket inclusive of the user identifier", the Examiner refers again to the same portions of the description and Fig. 5C as those referred to in connection with the above paragraph 1. Fig. 5 C is a customer table, but not a ticket. There is no suggestion of an issuer's preparing an electronic ticket.

5. Concerning the feature "to transmit the electronic tickets to the account unit through the communication network", the Examiner again refers to the same portions of the description as in paragraph 2 above. In the reselling system according to the Walker patent, the ticket number of a sold or purchased ticket is transmitted through the network, and the resold ticket is voided and assigned a replacement ticket number (col. 8, lines 15-19). In this connection, further explanation is given at col. 13, lines 47-55 that venue controller 400 creates the replacement ticket number and transmits it to a central controller 200 which, in turn, sends the replacement ticket number to the customer as explained at col. 14, lines 13-19. That is, in the Walker reselling system, a ticket equivalent (ticket number) is created by the venue (i.e. issuer) and transmitted to the customer via the central controller and when the customer wants to use the ticket equivalent (ticket number), the customer prints the ticket number and takes it to the venue and uses it to gain access to the desired event (col. 14, lines 13-19).

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

It should be noted that the Walker system is a reselling system and the central controller deals with electronic information on the tickets to be sold or purchased, but does not deal with original tickets themselves which are supposed to be in a printed form on a piece of paper as can be interpreted from the descriptions at col. 12, lines 9-16, col. 13, lines 47-55 and col. 14, lines 13-22. For the sold tickets, the venue controller creates a replacement ticket number and sends it to the central controller (col. 13, lines 40-55).

6. With respect to the feature "causing the account unit corresponding to the user's account address to store the electronic tickets in a storage in said account unit", the Examiner refers to the same portions in the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 1, and specifically refers to customer ID in the table 530. However, the table 530 does not contain electronic tickets, nor does the Examiner clarify where the electronic tickets are stored, that is, the Examiner fails to show what part in the Walker system corresponds to the account unit in the present invention.

Further, in connection with the newly added limitation, the Examiner refers again to the same portions of the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 1, stating that customer database 530 maintains a plurality of records such as records 546, 548, each associated with a different customer. A customer registered in the customer table 530 may buy tickets or sell tickets or both. Customer table 530 stores a unique ID for each customer and name and address information in fields 534 and 536. However, the Examiner fails to show where those electronic tickets which were bought by customers are stored. In the Walker system, there is no device which is equivalent to the account unit in the present invention.

7. With respect to claim 3, the Examiner refers to the comparison by the central controller of received customer ID and information already stored in the table 530. This comparison is performed when a customer logs on to the system. Thus, the comparison has nothing to do with verification of validity of tickets performed in step (d) of claim 3.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

8. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to access the account address of the user upon receiving the demand for issuance" in claim 2, the Examiner refers to the same Abstract and portions of the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 2. However, in the Walker system, the venue controller (which is assumed to correspond to the issuer unit) simply sends a replacement ticket number (not ticket) to the central controller 200 and does not access to account address.

9. With respect to the feature "causing the accessed account unit to transmit a certificate of account address which guarantees a correspondence relationship between the account address assigned to the user and an identifier of the user of the account unit to the issuer" in claim 2, the Examiner refers to the description from col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 25. The referred portion explains that when a purchase offer is received, the central controller contacts a credit issuer to check if the buyer has valid credit, and when acceptance of the offer is received from a seller, the central controller contacts the seller's credit card issuer to check if the seller's credit is sufficient to cover a penalty for non-performance. The Walker patent does not teach the use of a certificate which guarantees a relationship between the account address of the account unit and an identifier of the user of the account unit.

10. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to verify the certificate of account address and allowing it to use the identifier of the user contained in the certificate of account address as the user identifier upon successful verification", the Examiner refers to Fig. 5C and the description from col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 7. These portions of the descriptions relate to an explanation of the contents of customer table 630 among which are customer ID, name, address, and credit card number. There is no suggested use of any certificate of account address.

Regarding the Examiner's Remarks, it has already been explained that the comparison by the central controller between a customer ID and information already stored in customer table 530 is to determine if the customer has already registered or not, it is not to determine the validity of an electronic ticket (col. 8, lines 35-42). The Examiner interprets the customer ID as the electronic right information. However, in the previous amendment, the wording "electronic

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

rights information" was changed to "electronic tickets" to avoid such misinterpretation. In the present claim 1, "electronic ticket" includes "user identifier" but the identifier is used for a different purpose than that of the Walker system. It is not clear from the Examiner's arguments which parts in the Walker system are supposed to correspond to the issuer unit, account unit, and ticket examiner unit of the present invention.

For the reasons set forth above the claims as amended are believed to be in condition for allowance.

After consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney of record to arrange for an interview so that the prosecution may be expedited to a prompt but just conclusion.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20162-00557-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Morris Liss

Registration No.: 24,510

No Attorney

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE &amp; HUTZ LLP

1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036-3425

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant